



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

✓

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/900,486    07/25/97    ANDERSON    E    P132/766

┌

LM02/0331

└

WAGNER MURABITO & HAO  
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET  
THIRD FLOOR  
SAN JOSE CA 95113

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NGUYEN, T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2782

5

DATE MAILED:

03/31/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/900,486

Applicant(s)

Eric Anderson And Patricia Scardino

Examiner

Tanh Quang Nguyen

Group Art Unit

2782

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 25, 1997

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Jul 25, 1997 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 1, 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2782

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description. Item 836(c) in Fig. 8B is not referred in the specification. Applicant is required to review the drawings for similar error(s) and make appropriate corrections.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The word “manger” on p. 21, line 10 is misspelled;

FIG. 5A on p. 19, line 2 is not part of the drawings; and

The label for LCD screen 402 on p.16, line 15 is not consistent with the LCD screen 302 in FIG. 3.

Applicant is required to review the specifications for similar error(s) and make appropriate corrections.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 4-8, 10 and 14-18 recite the limitation "said parameter manager" in line 2 of claims 4-8, line 1 of claim 10 and line 2 of claims 14-18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the mentioned claims.

Art Unit: 2782

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Howes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,403,303)**.

Howes et al. teaches a system and a method for controlling parameters in an electronic device, comprising:

a series of parameter storage locations for containing value sets corresponding to said parameters (col. 17, lines 39-46);

a set of parameter commands for controlling said value sets (col. 18, lines 9-15);

a parameter manager device for executing said set of parameter commands (col. 18 lines 16-18 and lines 38-55);

a current parameters location containing value sets corresponding to current parameters (col. 17, lines 39-42);

Art Unit: 2782

a user defaults location containing value sets corresponding to user defaults (col.

17, lines 45-46);

a factory defaults location containing value sets corresponding to factory defaults

(col. 17, lines 43-44);

said current parameters location is in a random-access memory (col. 20, lines 18-20);

said user defaults location is in an electrically-erasable programmable read-only memory

(col.20, lines 4-7);

said factory defaults location is in a non-volatile memory (col. 19, lines 65-67);

a command to provide one or more of said value sets

from said current parameters location to an external command source (col.

20, lines 49-55);

from said user defaults location to a processor (col. 17, lines 53-59);

from said current parameters location to a processor (col. 20, lines 11-17);

from said factory defaults location to an external command source (col.4, lines 7-

14);

a command to set one or more of said value sets

in said current parameters location based on information received from an external

command source (col. 20, lines 49-55);

Art Unit: 2782

in said user defaults location based on information selectively obtained from one of a processor within said electronic device (col. 20, lines 11-17), an external command source (col. 19, lines 61-64), said current parameters location (col. 20, lines 56-62) and said factory defaults location (col. 17, lines 47-52);

in said current parameters location based on information received from a processor within said electronic device (col. 17, lines 60-62);

a command to restore one or more of said value sets

in said current parameters location to information selected from said factory defaults location (col.20, line 66-col. 21, line 4);

in said current parameters location to information selected from said user defaults location (col. 20, lines 41-48 and col.21, lines 5-11);

said set of parameter commands are originated by an external command source and said parameter manager device responsively accesses parameter information in a resource file to control said parameters (col. 18, line 6-col. 19, line 34); and

said parameter manager acts on all of said parameters in one of said series of parameter locations if a corresponding one of said set of parameter commands does not

Art Unit: 2782

specify a particular one of said parameters (col. 18, lines 31-37 and col. 21, lines 52-54).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 19 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howes, et al. in view of **Filion et al. (U.S Pat. No. 5,224,207)**.

Howes et al. teaches all the features of the invention except a computer-readable medium comprising of program instructions for controlling parameters in an electronic device; wherein said medium is a memory device which is removable for reprogramming, and which contains scripts that execute said set of parameter commands to cause said parameter manager to control said value sets corresponding to said parameters.

Filion et al., however, teaches such a computer-readable medium for controlling parameters in an electronic device (col. 20, lines 1-8).

Art Unit: 2782

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Howes et al. and Filion et al. because they both direct to controlling parameters in an electronic device and Filion et al.'s afore mentioned teachings would result in a more flexible system.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Christeson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,581) teaches a method for CMOS configuration information storage and retrieval in flash.

Makino (U.S. Pat. No. 5,495,559) teaches a non-volatile memory data initialization / rewrite apparatus for a printer.

Samuels (U.S. Pat. No. 5,270,821) teaches a video display adjustment and on-screen menu system.


Stefik et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,534,975) teaches a document processing system utilizing document service cards to provide document processing services.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Quang Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0138. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.



Art Unit: 2782

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.



THOMAS C. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700

TQN

March 26, 1999